DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 111 TM 860 202

AUTHOR	Yagi, Kan; And Others
TITLE	ECIA, Chapter 1: Disadvantaged Child Project. Portland Public Schools Year-End Evaluation Report, 1984-85.
INSTITUTION	Portland Public Schools, OR. Research and Evaluation Dept.
PUB DATE	Dec 85
NOTE	37p.; Figure 1 (pages 11-20) contains small print.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Achievement Gains; Achievement Tests; Basic Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mathematics Skills; Private Schools; Program Implementation; Public Schools; *Reading Skills; *School Districts; Scores; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; HOSTS Program; Portland School District OR; Prescription Learning System

ABSTRACT

The Portland Public Schools 1984-85 Chapter 1 project included 4 public high schools, 48 public elementary schools, and 14 nonpublic elementary schools. About 6,500 students received supplementary support in basic skills, reading and/or math, in the 66 schools. These schools implemented three types of programs: HOSTS, Prescription Learning System and Garden Variety individual school-developed programs. Due to student needs and high mobility, Chapter 1 instruction is highly individualized or in small groups. Summative evaluation of the project showed satisfactory progress of the students overall in reading and math regardless of the particular program in which they were enrolled. Differences in achievement of students in the three programs were not sufficiently marked to merit endorsing one program over another. The average gains of nearly every Chapter 1 school program were equal to or larger than the average for the district. A research model and strategy for studying selected variables and their effect on student achievement were developed in the 1984-85 school year. The next step is to develop theories and ways to measure the variables. Details of this research study are presented in a separate report currently in draft form. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267111

1984-85 EVALUATION REPORT

ECIA, CHAPTER I Disadvantaged Child Project

IN THE PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Research and Evaluation Dept.
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon
Walter E. Hathaway, Director

Kan Yagi
Margaret Dey
James Kushmuk

December, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Yagi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 860202

ECIA, CHAPTER I
DISADVANTAGED CHILD PROJECT
YEAR-END EVALUATION REPORT

1984-85

Kan Yagi
Margaret Dey
James Kushmuk

Research and Evaluation Department
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon

ECIA, Chapter I
Administrative Summary

The Portland Public Schools 1984-85 Chapter I project included 4 public high schools, 48 public elementary schools, and 14 nonpublic elementary schools. About 6,500 students received supplementary support in basic skills, reading and/or math, in the 66 schools. The total budget was about $3.5 million. The project advocates costs to be about $550 per student; actual costs were slightly less.

To a large extent, the Portland project consisted of 66 quite unique projects, even though over half of them used commercial systems either as part or all of their Chapter I program. Among the public schools, there were 14 schools that used the Prescription Learning System, 20 that used HOSTS, and 18 that used systems of their own design or largely unique systems. Non public schools with their small enrollments of Chapter I students also designed their own programs.

Due to the student needs and high mobility, Chapter I instruction is highly individualized or in small groups. The average stability index of 70.8 percent for the 48 Chapter I public elementary and middle schools was over 10 percent lower than the average among non-Chapter I schools. Turnover among Chapter I students each year is about 30 percent to 35 percent.

The 1984-85 achievement test results for public school Chapter I students in Grades 3 to 8 in reading and math showed gains that were quite consistently larger than those of the total District. Wide variations in gains were observed among schools and grades. Average gains for about 80 percent of the Chapter I schools were larger than District averages. Achievement records for the last seven years showed that, across the grades, the gains of Chapter I students for 1984-85 were as large or larger than the average of project students in previous years. Achievement data for Chapter I students in grades one and two were collected using different instruments; however, the results for 1984-85 appeared quite satisfactory. Data for Chapter I students in nonpublic schools were collected spring to spring rather than fall to spring. Results for these students were also quite satisfactory.

Three special Chapter I studies were conducted in 1984-85. Two involved exemplary programs which have been implemented and evaluated the past three years. The third was the initial phases of establishing a research plan to study effective classroom practices. This research plan is an outgrowth of previous longitudinal studies and studies of various program characteristics and variables. Separate reports have been prepared for these special Chapter I studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND PROGRAM VARIABLES	2
3. SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS	11
3a. Public and Nonpublic Schools Chapter I Students -- Grades 1 and 2	11
3b. Public School Chapter I Students -- Grades 3 to 8 and Grades 9 to 12	16
3c. Nonpublic School Chapter I Students -- Grades 4 to 8	20
4. CONCLUSIONS FROM SPECIAL CHAPTER I STUDIES	22
5. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS	24
6. INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL DATA FOR GRADE 1 AND STATE CHAPTER I REPORTING FORMS	25

1. INTRODUCTION

The PPS Chapter I project for 1984-85 included 4 public high schools, 48 public elementary and middle schools, and 14 nonpublic elementary schools. The nonpublic Chapter I schools are located within the geographic areas served by Chapter I public schools and serve only those qualifying students who reside within the Chapter I public school service area. About 6,500 students were served by the 66 Chapter I schools. All but one high school and two public elementary schools had Chapter I programs for both reading and math. Based on the students in Grades 3 to 8 where reading and math are taught as more discrete subjects, each year about 30 to 35 percent of the students are enrolled in reading only, about 20 to 25 percent in math only, and the remaining 45 percent or so are enrolled in both subjects.

This evaluation report contains information for all 66 Chapter I schools and is organized according to the following sections:

1. Introduction
2. Program Descriptions and Program Variables
3. Summary of Achievement Test Results
   a. Public and Nonpublic School Chapter I Students -- Grades 1 and 2
   b. Public School Chapter I Students -- Grades 3 to 8 and 9 to 12
   c. Nonpublic School Chapter I Students -- Grades 4 to 8
4. Findings of Special Chapter I Studies
5. Summary and Comments
6. Individual School Data for Grade 1 and State Chapter I Reporting Forms

2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND VARIABLES

In previous years, narrative descriptions of Chapter I programs in each school were prepared and included in the year-end reports. While these descriptions provided information on the nature of the programs in each school, this information was not organized and in the appropriate form to be useful for evaluation purposes. By treating the information for selected variables used to describe programs in a certain way and by the computerization of student data to facilitate analyses, it is now possible to explore the relationship of program variables to student achievement scores.

In Table 1, the variables are identified and described, and the coding for them in terms of percents, actual counts, or identification code number is indicated. Figure 1 shows the characteristics of the 48 public elementary and middle school programs according to the selected variables.[1] For most variables, there were sufficient variations among schools to indicate the uniqueness among them and the complexity of the Portland Chapter I project. To a large extent the Portland project consists of 66 quite independent projects. Among the public school programs there were 13 elementary schools that implemented the Prescription Learning Program, 20 implemented HOSTS (two had both Prescription Learning and HOSTS) and the remaining 21, including high schools, were programs designed by the schools or largely unique instructional systems. Most commercial programs are quite expensive and not well adapted to small enrollments, so the private schools, all of which have small Chapter I enrollments, design their own programs.

Most of the 48 public elementary school Chapter I programs described first required that students be taken out of regular non-basic skills classes and given supplementary instruction in separate classrooms or laboratories. This instruction of 30 to 40 minutes per day was usually highly individualized or small groups and presented by teachers, aides, or usually both. The curriculum was usually coordinated with the regular classroom curriculum either through the work between teachers matching their curriculums or by the Chapter I teacher matching with achievement test goals, or both. Difficulty in appropriately matching instruction with individual student achievement is compounded by the mobility of Chapter I students. The average mobility for Chapter I schools is about double that of non-Chapter I schools.

At the high school level, students are selected and enrolled in Chapter I classes which are administered and conducted like other regular high school classes. A distinction, however, is that students may receive credit for the

---

[1]Much of the information for the 4 high schools and 14 nonpublic schools programs is either not available, not applicable, or cannot be interpreted in the same manner as for the other 48 schools; therefore, the descriptions for these 18 programs are not like those of the others. Currently, none of these programs are included in special studies.

classes as elective classes but not as required classes - a stipulation that Chapter I can supplement, but not supplant, regular instruction. High schools are quite unlike elementary schools and a number of program descriptors do not apply or cannot be interpreted in the same way; therefore, such descriptors have been coded NA in Figure 1 to avoid misinterpretation.

Chapter I programs in nonpublic schools tend to be small with a few students at a time meeting with a teacher for instruction. Here, too, nonpublic schools are somewhat unlike the public schools and some program descriptors do not apply or cannot be interpreted in the same way; therefore, the Code NA has been used for some descriptors.

TABLE 1
CODES[1] FOR FIGURE 1: CHARACTERISTICS
OF CHAPTER I SCHOOL PROGRAMS

1. School: PPS three-digit school identification numbers. Where programs are different for grades/subjects within a school, the information is shown on additional lines.

2. N Total: School enrollment reported in PPS 1984 Enrollment Report (Count is taken October 1, 1984).

3. Mobil: Mobility of students in a school is expressed as the percent of all students enrolled during the year that was enrolled in that same school at the beginning and end of the year subtracted from 100. (Data source: Achievement Profiles, August 1985.)

4. N Chap I: Number of students in the school identified on the District computer file as being in any Chapter I program (unduplicated count) at the end of the school year.

5. % Chap I: Number of students in Chapter I (Item 4 above) divided by the school enrollment (Item 2 above).

6. N Read: Number of students in Chapter I reading program.

7. N Math: Number of students in Chapter I math program.

8. Cap: Chapter I Coordinators ratings of their programs operations in relation to their capacity using a five-point scale where 1 = under capacity (resources greater than student needs), 3 = at capacity (resources equal to student needs), and 5 = over capacity (student needs greater than resources). Ratings of 2 and 4 were not labeled.

9. Wait R: Number of students on Chapter I waiting list for reading.

10. Wait M: Number of students on Chapter I waiting list for math.

Items 11 to 17 refer to Chapter I reading programs in each school.

11. Grade: Grades for which the description of the reading program applied.

12. Type and Prog: Type of Chapter I program as defined by State guidelines where 1 = in-class, 2 = pull out, 3 = laboratory, 4 = regular classroom and pullout, 5 = regular classroom and laboratory, 6 = pullout and laboratory, and 7 = other. Prog was used to indicate a second kind of program where one was indicated. 0 indicates no second program.

---

[1]Code NA entered when information was not applicable or interpret in the same way as for other schools. Information up to the double line applies to the total school; beyond this line the information applies to the particular grade or subject as indicated.

13. Chap I Min/Wk: The number of minutes per week the program devoted to Chapter I reading.

14. Reg Min/Wk: The number of minutes per week the regular school program devoted to reading.

15. Cptr: Indicates if a computer was used in the Chapter I reading program where 0 = not used, 1 = used for managing instruction, 2 = used for providing instruction, and 3 = computer used for both purposes.

16. T/S Ratio: Teacher (tutor) to student ratio in Chapter I where the number indicates the number of students per teacher. Where schools reported a range, the higher number was entered.

17. Coordination Instr: The number indicates a rate of how often Chapter I staff interacted during the year with the regular classroom teachers to coordinate instruction where 0 = never, 1 = once or twice, 2 = quarterly, 3 = monthly, 4 = weekly, 5 = (estimates given averaged more than once a week).

    a. Formal: Formal meetings to discuss student progress.
    b. Instr Plan: Joint instructional planning conferences.
    c. Inform: Informal conferences to discuss student progress.
    d. Visit: Visit by Chapter I staff to regular classroom to observe Chapter I students during other instruction.

22-32: The next 11 items refer to Chapter I math programs in which the codes are the same as for corresponding items 11 through 21.

33. CTBS/PALT: The number of times during the year the Chapter I staff used CTBS/PALT achievement test data for student selection and instructional planning. Where the number of times reported was 10 or greater, the code "9" was entered.

34. Other Tests: The number of times during the year the Chapter I staff used data from other tests to assess performances, monitor progress, or assist in instruction.

Figure 1
Characteristics of Chapter 1 School Programs
1984-85

School	N Total	Mobil	N Chap 1	% Chap 1	N Read	N Math	Cap	Wait R	Wait M	READING Grade	Type	Prog	Chap 1 Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Instr Plan	Inform	Visit	MATH Grade	Type	Prog	Chap 1 Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Instr Plan	Inform	Visit	CTBS/ PALT	Oth Te
131	331	27.2	71	21.5	42	48	3	0	0	1	2	0	120	300	0	6	3	3	3	0											3	1
							3	5	0	2-5	6	0	120	200	1	6	2	1	3	0	3-5	6	0	50	200	2	9	2	1	2	0	4	9
134	215	35.5	75	34.9	75	75	3	0	0	1-5	6	0	75	300	3	10	3	3	3	1	1-5	6	0	75	300	3	10	3	3	3	1	3	2
232	415	26.9	72	17.3	59	36	3	0	0	1-5	2	0	150	300	0	8	1	0	3	0	1-5	2	0	120	300	0	5	1	0	3	0	4	6
138	228	48.3	158	69.3	154	130	4	5	5	K-1	1	0	-	300	0	1	-	-	-	-	K-1	1	0	-	300	0	1	-	-	-	-	2	9
							4	13	15	2-4	1	2	150	300	3	8	-	-	-	-	2-4	1	0	150	200	3	8	-	-	-	-	2	9
140	561	32.4	121	21.6	120	96	4	29	29	K-5	2	0	120	350	3	7	2	1	4	2	K-5	2	0	90	275	3	7	2	1	4	2	9	9
141	741	18.2	177	23.9	150	133	2	0	0	1-5	6	0	210	150	2	8	1	1	1	1	1-5	6	0	210	150	2	8	1	1	1	1	2	1
239	138	47.2	34	24.6	23	28	3	0	0	1-5	2	0	80	300	2	5	2	1	1	1	1-5	2	0	80	300	2	5	2	1	1	1	4	2
143	253	40.3	93	36.8	84	65	3	0	0	1-3	3	0	150	300	3	5	2	5	4	5	1-3	3	0	150	300	3	5	2	5	4	5	4	9
							3	0	0	4-5	3	0	150	250	3	5	2	5	4	5	4-5	3	0	150	225	3	5	2	5	4	5	4	9
146	366	31.2	73	19.9	58	36	2	0	0	1	2	0	150	475	3	8	2	2	3	2	1	2	0	150	225	3	8	2	2	3	2	9	9
							2	0	0	2	2	0	150	450	3	5	2	2	3	2	2	2	0	150	300	3	5	2	2	3	2	9	9
							2	0	0	3-5	2	0	150	300	0	5	2	2	3	2	3-5	2	0	150	275	0	5	2	2	3	2	9	9
148	370	34.0	28	7.6	28	4	3	0	0	K-2	6	0	150	300	0	6	2	3	3	1	K-2	6	0	-	250	0	6	2	3	3	1	9	2
							4	0	0	3-5	6	0	200	300	0	4	2	3	3	1	3-5	6	0	-	250	0	4	2	3	3	1	9	2
150	438	33.9	128	29.2	112	38	3	0	0	1	1	0	150	300	0	8	2	2	2	NA														
							3	0	0	2	5	0	150	300	2	9	1	1	3	1														
							3	0	0	3-4	5	0	90	300	2	9	1	1	4	1	3-4	5	0	60	240	2	9	1	1	4	1	3	9
243	370	35.3	115	31.1	84	98	3	5	5	1	2	0	60	300	0	6	1	2	3	0	1	2	0	60	150	0	6	1	2	3	0	1	1
							5	8	-	2-5	3	0	120	300	3	3	1	2	3	0												4	6
							4	-	4																								
							3	1	0	K	2	0	60	150	2	4	1	2	3	0	2-5	3	0	60	150	2	6	1	1	3	0	3	1
248	351	28.4	98	27.9	80	58	4	0	0	1-5	2	0	200	300	2	10	4	4	4	0	K	2	0	20	75	2	4	1	2	3	0	1	0
156	561	25.2	168	29.9	160	50	4	8	6	5-8	3	0	95	95	3	16	2	1	3	0	1-5	2	0	150	200	2	10	4	4	4	0	3	3
																					5-8	3	0	95	95	3	16	2	1	3	0	2	9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 1
Characteristics of Chapter I School Programs
1984-85

School	N Total	Mobil	N Chap I	% Chap I	N Read	N Math	Cap	Wait R	Wait M	READING Grade	Type	Prog	Chap I Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Instr Plan	Inform	Visit	MATH Grade	Type	Prog	Chap I Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Instr Plan	Inform	Visit	CTBS/ PALT	Oth Te
252	246	14.5	92	37.4	51	68	4	0	0	5-8	4	0	40	100	0	12	3	3	3	1	5-8	4	0	40	30	0	12	3	3	3	1	3	3
255	390	31.4	109	27.9	109	25	3	10	10	K	2	0	120	-	0	3	2	2	3	1												
							4	6	6	1	2	0	90	300	0	6	2	1	3	1	K	2	0	30	300	0	6	2	1	3	1	2	2
							4	10	0	2-5	2	0	120	300	3	1	2	2	1	1												
257	679	25.7	89	13.1	66	51	3	0	0	6-8	1	0	215	-	0	6	2	4	4	-	6-8	1	0	215	-	0	6	2	4	4	-	4	9
164	500	30.9	134	26.8	120	53	4	17	8	2-5	5	0	150	45	2	6	2	1	1	0	2-5	5	0	150	45	2	6	2	1	1	0	2	9
259	553	22.1	88	15.9	61	44	4	0	0	1-5	1	2	150	300	0	6	2	-	-	-	1-5	1	2	225	-	0	6	2	-	-	-	2	-
166	535	30.9	75	14.0	48	33	5	2	0	2-3	2	0	150	400	1	1	0	0	3	0											2	5
							5	0	10																						3	6
							3	0	0	6-8	2	0	175	275	0	6	0	0	2	0	4-5	6	0	225	200	2	6	0	0	2	0	2	0
261	567	23.8	74	13.1	71	66	3	12	7	6-8	3	0	200	200	2	15	2	2	2	1	6-8	2	0	160	275	0	4	0	0	2	0	3	6
258	629	37.2	214	34.0	175	76	3	0	0	1-3	1	0	150	220	0	8	3	2	4	4	6-8	3	0	200	200	2	15	2	2	2	1	9	4
							3	0	0	4-8	4	0	150	220	0	8	3	2	4	4											9	9
168	330	41.9	157	47.6	44	149	4	0	0	1-5	6	0	120	150	2	5	2	2	4	1	4-8	4	0	150	220	2	8	3	2	4	4	9	9
262	658	30.9	193	29.3	181	171	3	0	0	K-5	1	2	90	200	0	6	1	2	3	2	1-5	6	0	100	150	2	5	2	2	4	1	3	3
263	422	34.3	136	32.2	97	95	4	0	0	1-3	4	3	120	250	0	12	1	1	3	1	K-5	3	0	90	200	0	6	1	2	3	2	3	9
							4	0	0	4-6	4	0	250	-	0	12	1	1	2	-	1-3	4	0	60	250	0	12	1	1	3	1	9	7
266	392	33.3	114	29.1	63	69	3	5	0	1-8	2	0	120	300	2	6	2	1	3	0	4-6	4	0	250	-	0	12	1	1	2	1	3	7
							5	10	0	1-2	2	0	150	300	0	6	2	1	3	0	1-8	2	0	120	200	0	6	2	1	3	0	3	5
268	293	27.6	98	33.4	82	35	5	20	10	K-3	4	0	150	150	3	10	4	3	4	3											3	5
							3	0	0	4-5	4	0	150	150	3	6	2	3	4	3	K-3	4	0	150	150	0	10	4	3	4	3	2	3
270	306	33.3	88	28.8	84	34	3	0	0	1-2	6	0	150	300	3	6	1	1	3	1	4-5	4	0	150	150	3	6	2	3	4	3	2	3
							3	0	0	3-4	6	0	150	300	3	6	1	1	3	1											9	9
							3	1	3	5	6	0	150	300	3	6	1	1	3	1	3-4	6	0	150	300	3	6	1	1	3	1	9	9
178	648	19.5	134	20.7	121	122	3	0	0	6-8	5	3	120	450	3	10	1	1	1	1	5	6	0	150	300	3	6	1	1	3	1	9	9
																					6-8	5	3	120	225	3	10	1	1	1	1	3	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 1
Characteristics of Chapter 1 School Programs
1984-85

School	N Total	Mobil	N Chap 1	% Chap 1	N Read	N Math	Cap	Wait R	Wait M	READING Grade	Type	Prog	Chap 1 Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Coordination Instr Plan	Coordination Inform	Coordination Visit
180	388	22.2	51	13.1	47	16	5	10	0	1-8	6	0	200	250	2	15	1	3	4	2
182	358	30.8	164	45.8	109	114	4	0	0	5-8	3	0	210	210	0	8	1	0	3	1
274	160	20.7	77	48.1	69	47	3	0	0	1-4	2	0	120	150	1	4	1	1	1	1
275	319	26.8	92	28.8	87	76	5	0	0	1-5	5	0	120	300	3	1	3	3	4	5
							4	0	0											
276	497	35.2	121	24.3	90	60	3	-	-	1-5	1	0	150	250	1	-	-	-	-	-
279	587	22.0	128	21.8	89	73	4	15	-	K-5	2	3	150	150	3	6	1	3	5	0
							4		0											
282	491	22.9	54	11.0	54	0	4	5	-	2-5	2	0	120	225	3	1	1	1	1	0
283	502	22.7	87	17.3	54	60	3	0	0	5	2	0	185	185	3	14	1	1	3	0
							3	0	0	6-8	5	0	185	185	3	9	1	3	4	0
284	440	38.0	48	10.9	38	30	3	0	0	1	1	0	240	150	0	9	3	1	4	3
							3	0	0	2	4	0	150	240	0	6	2	1	4	3
							3	0	0	3-4	4	0	120	180	0	10	2	4	3	3
291	360	35.4	108	30.0	89	51	3	0	0	K-1	3	0	300	250	2	4	3	2	4	1
							3	0	0	2-3	6	0	150	200	2	3	2	3	2	0
							3	0	0	4-5	2	0	120	200	2	3	2	0	2	0
299	497	14.0	162	32.6	97	133	3	0	-	6	5	0	200	NA	2	9	4	1	1	0
							4	0	-	6-8	5	0	200	NA	1	10	3	3	2	2
							5	-	0											
284	615	35.4	169	27.5	119	60	3	0	-	2-5	3	0	150	450	3	12	0	1	2	0
							3	-	0											
286	355	28.5	66	18.6	47	50	3	4	0	1-7	2	0	150	250	3	1	3	1	5	1
288	922	26.2	380	41.2	284	316	3	-	-	6-8	2	3	140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MATH Grade	Type	Prog	Chap 1 Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Coordination Instr Plan	Coordination Inform	Coordination Visit	CTBS/ PALT	Oth Te
1-8	6	0	200	250	2	15	1	3	4	2	9	5
5-8	3	0	210	210	0	8	1	0	3	1	4	2
1-4	2	0	120	150	0	4	1	1	1	1	3	4
1-5	5	0	120	225	3	6	3	3	4	5	9	9
1-5	1	0	150	250	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
											2	0
K-5	2	0	150	150	3	8	3	2	2	2	9	1
											4	3
5	2	0	185	185	3	14	1	1	3	0	2	2
6-8	5	0	185	185	3	9	1	3	4	0	2	2
1	1	0	120	150	0	9	3	1	4	3	2	0
2	1	0	120	150	0	6	2	1	4	3	2	3
3-4	2	0	150	150	0	10	2	4	3	3	2	3
1	1	0	315	225	2	4	3	2	4	5	0	9
2-3	6	0	175	200	2	3	2	3	2	0	2	3
4-5	2	0	220	225	2	3	2	0	2	0	2	3
											5	3
											9	9
6	1	0	250	NA	2	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	9
											2	4
K	1	0	30	120	0	6	4	3	4	4	2	4
1-2	1	0	60	240	0	6	4	3	4	4	2	4
1-7	6	0	150	250	2	8	3	1	5	1	3	3
6-8	2	3	120	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

15

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

16

Figure 1
Characteristics of Chapter 1 School Programs
1984-85

School	N Total	Mobil	N Chap 1	% Chap 1	N Read	N Math	Cap	Wait R	Wait M	READING Grade	Type	Prog	Chap I Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Instr Plan	Inform	Visit	MATH Grade	Type	Prog	Chap I Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Instr Plan	Inform	Visit	CTBS/ PALT	Oth Te
290	469	28.8	107	22.8	106	29	4	18	9	K-8	4	0	150	250	2	3	1	2	4	4	K-8	2	0	90	200	2	3	1	2	4	4	4	6
292	227	22.1	53	23.3	52	10	3	0	0	1-4	2	0	80	360	3	3	1	1	1	1	1-4	2	0	80	120	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	6
294	498	30.2	99	19.9	80	64	4	14	14	1-5	2	0	150	300	0	7	0	3	4	1												3	4
							4	-	-												1-2	1	0	90	225	2	7	1	1	1	1	3	3
							4	-	-												3-5	2	0	90	225	2	7	1	1	1	1	3	4
296	231	25.8	65	28.1	53	26	3	0	0	1-2	2	0	150	150	0	7	3	3	4	3	1-2	2	0	150	150	2	7	3	3	4	3	4	-
							3	0	0	3-5	6	0	225	150	3	7	3	3	4	3	3-5	6	0	225	150	3	7	3	3	4	3	4	9
298	197	15.5	38	19.3	38	0	3	0	-	1	2	0	120	180	0	4	3	3	4	1												2	3
							3	0	-	2-5	2	0	120	180	1	1	3	2	3	1												8	3
High School Programs																																	
217	1752	NA	214	NA	162	123	NA	0	0	9-10	NA	NA	225	NA	3	12	2	NA	NA	NA	9-10	NA	NA	225	NA	0	12	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
118	1427	NA	292	NA	230	171	NA	0	0	9-12	NA	NA	235	NA	2	8	2	NA	NA	NA	9-12	NA	NA	235	NA	2	12	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
218	1531	NA	98	NA	66	91	NA	0	0	9-12	NA	NA	250	NA	0	15	2	NA	NA	NA	9-12	NA	NA	250	NA	0	15	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
124	1142	NA	222	NA	222	-	NA	0	0	9-12	NA	NA	250	NA	0	18	2	NA	NA	NA	-											NA	NA
Non-Public School Programs																																	
901	NA	NA	19	NA	19	0	3	7	0	1-6	2	0	75	200	3	3	0	1	2	0												5	5
902	NA	NA	14	NA	11	7	3	0	0	2	2	0	60	510	0	2	1	1	3	0												2	6
							3	0	0	4	2	0	60	335	0	3	1	3	3	0	4	2	0	60	360	0	3	1	3	3	0	2	6
							3	0	0	5	2	0	60	370	0	3	1	4	4	0	5	2	0	60	280	0	3	1	4	4	0	2	6
							3	0	0	6-7	-	0	60	285	0	1	1	3	3	0	6-7	2	0	60	285	0	1	1	3	3	0	2	6
							3	0	2	8	2	0	60	150	0	2	1	3	3	0	8	-	0	60	-	0	2	1	3	3	0	2	6

Figure 1
Characteristics of Chapter I School Programs
1984-85

School	N Total	Mobil	N Chap I	% Chap I	N Read	N Math	Cap	Wait R	Wait M	READING Grade	Type	Prog	Chap I Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Coordination Instr Plan	Coordination Inform	Coordination Visit	MATH Grade	Type	Prog	Chap I Min/wk	Reg Min/wk	Cptr	T/S Ratio	Coordination Formal	Coordination Instr Plan	Coordination Inform	Coordination Visit	CTBS/ PALT	Other Tes
903	NA	NA	11	NA	6	5	2	0	0	1-2	2	0	45	170	0	1	1	2	4	2											–	–
							4	2	2	78	2	0	60	120	0	4	1	3	3	1	28	2	0	135	90	0	4	1	3	3	1	3	3
904	NA	NA	21	NA	13	12	3	0	-	K-1	2	0	30	300	0	3	3	3	4	1											–	3
							4	0	4	2-3	2	0	120	300	2	4	3	3	4	1											5	4
							5	3	4	4-8	2	0	120	300	3	4	3	3	4	0	4-8	2	0	75	300	3	4	4	3	3	4	5	4
905	NA	NA	24	NA	21	3	3	0	0	1-3	2	0	90	390	0	3	1	1	3	0											2	6
							3	0	0	4	2	0	80	570	0	3	1	1	3	0	4	2	0	90	345	0	3	1	1	3	0	2	6
906	NA	NA	13	NA	13	2	3	0	0	1-2	2	0	60	160	0	3	1	2	4	2											3	0
							4	4	2	3-8	2	0	60	200	0	3	1	2	3	1	3-8	2	0	60	120	0	3	1	2	3	1	2	2
907	NA	NA	19	NA	18	5	5	5	2	K-2	2	0	150	225	0	2	0	3	4	1											3	2
							5	4	4	3-5	2	0	150	225	0	2	0	3	4	1	3-5	2	0	150	225	0	2	0	3	4	1	3	2
							5	4	4	6-8	2	0	150	225	0	4	0	3	4	1	6-8	2	0	150	225	0	4	0	3	4	1	3	2
908	NA	NA	38	NA	38	0	3	3	-	1-4	6	0	150	300	2	3	1	1	3	1											9	2
							3	0	-	5-8	6	0	120	225	0	3	1	0	1	0											9	2
909	NA	NA	9	NA	9	0	3	0	-	1-6	6	0	120	NA	0	2	3	2	2	-											2	9
910	NA	NA	19	NA	19	4	3	10	6	K-8	2	0	150	180	0	3	3	4	4	3	K-8	2	0	150	225	0	3	3	3	4	4	9	3
911	NA	NA	12	NA	9	4	5	3	3	K-8	2	0	90	450	0	3	3	4	4	4	K-8	2	0	90	225	0	3	3	4	4	4	9	4
912	NA	NA	17	NA	12	14	3	0	0	1-4	2	0	125	225	3	4	3	3	4	1	1-4	2	0	75	225	3	4	3	3	4	1	4	3
							3	0	0	5-8	2	0	50	225	3	4	3	3	4	1	5-8	2	0	75	225	3	4	3	3	4	1	5	4
913	NA	NA	19	NA	17	8	3	0	0	1-8	2	0	60	450	0	3	4	3	4	2	1-8	2	0	60	225	0	3	4	3	4	2	4	2
914	NA	NA	15	NA	10	6	5	5	3	K-8	2	0	90	450	0	3	1	4	4	1	K-8	2	0	90	225	0	3	1	4	4	1	9	4

3. SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Achievement information for each of the 66 Chapter I public and nonpublic schools is shown in the last section of this report: Individual School Data for Grade 1 and State Chapter I Reporting Forms. Section 3., Summary of Achievement Test Results, is a summary of the achievement test data for the Portland Public Schools Chapter I project as follows:

3.a Public School Chapter I Students, Grades 1 and 2;

3.b Public School Chapter I Students, Grades 3 through 8 and 9 through 12; and

3.c Nonpublic School Chapter I Students, Grades 1 and 2 and 4 through 8 (grade 3 students are not included due to the nature of the testing schedule and the test being used for evaluation).

Achievement scores for grades 1 and 2 in which a nationally standardized test was used are expressed in terms of Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) and other traditional scores of expanded scale scores and percentiles. The NCE scale is an equal interval, standard score scale transformed to match the percentile scale at the 1st, 50th, and 99th percentile points. It has a range of 1 to 99, a mean of 50, and a standard deviation of 21.06. Scores for grades 3 through 12 in which the Portland Achievement Levels Tests were used are expressed in terms of RIT scores. These scores are derived from an equal interval, single-growth scale underlying the Portland tests. RIT scores are converted to NCEs and reported here also. These latter scores make it possible to compare and aggregate scores for use at the state and national levels. Interpretations of the results include comparisons of Chapter I students with non-Chapter I students in the District and with all District students where appropriate data were available. NCE scores make it possible to compare achievements with the national norming populations and with Chapter I students in the State.

3.a Public School Chapter I Students, Grades 1 and 2

Chapter I program objectives for Grades 1 and 2 are as follows:

Grade 1 Objective: Given special assistance, pupils in grade one will show a mean posttest score in reading equivalent to the expanded scale score at the 15th percentile (i.e., scale score of 214) as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills.

Grade 2 Objective: Given special assistance, project participants in the subject area of reading in grade 2 will display a normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain of four (4) as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills.

The expected performance level for grade one students was determined by selecting the expanded scale score for the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) at approximately the eligibility criteria for Chapter I students, i.e., the 15th percentile on CTBS Primary B. This performance level was chosen because Chapter I students in grades three through eight constitute approximately the lower 15 percent of the student population. The expanded scale score at the 15th percentile level is the expected performance level for grade one Chapter I students.

Four District schools used CTBS, Form U for their Chapter I students (N = 66) while the remaining used CTBS, Form S (N = 549). Because the scores for the two tests cannot be converted to a common expanded scale score, the results are shown in Table 2 for students who took each form of the test.

Table 2 shows that the achieved expanded scale scores for students taking either Form U or Form S of the CTBS were higher than the expected scale scores at the 15th percentile. In turn, the achieved NCEs and percentiles are higher than the expected scores, but noticeably lower than national averages of 50 indicating a need still remains for many students in grade 1. Achievement information for individual schools is shown in Section 6.

An examination of the mean NCE scores for individual schools showed that scores for some were high enough that, perhaps, some students should not have been selected for Chapter I services. While it is not unreasonable to provide services for some of these students, schools should be cautious not to overlook students with greater needs or to dilute the services necessary for those who may need considerably more.

TABLE 2
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS*
SPRING 1985, CHAPTER I PUBLIC SCHOOLS, GRADE 1
POSTTEST SCORES**

	Form U Primary B N=66	Form S Primary B N=549	Total U/S N=615
Expected Expanded Scale Score	369.0	214.0	No Ave.
Achieved Expanded Scale Score	376.0	246.0	No Ave.
Expected Normal Curve Equivalent	28.2	28.2	28.2
Achieved Normal Curve Equivalent	35.2	42.2	41.1
Expected Percentile	15.0	15.0	15.0
Achieved Percentile	24.1	35.5	33.7

*CTBS, Form S, Level B, 1974 with 4 schools using Form U, Level B, 1981
**All out-of-level scores have been converted to in-level scores

Table 3 details the pretest and posttest means for 448 grade 2 Chapter I students in public schools who had matched Fall and Spring scores. Students were administered CTBS Primary B in the fall and Primary C in the spring. The out-of-level scores were converted to in-level scores prior to their inclusion in this evaluation report. The results are expressed in mean expanded scale scores, percentiles, and normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for students who were administered different forms of the CTBS.

TABLE 3
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS[1]
CHAPTER I PUBLIC SCHOOLS, GRADE 2
FALL 1984 - SPRING 1985[2]

	N	Expanded Scale[3] Score	Percentile	Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE)
Form S Schools: N = 36				
Fall Primary B	406	259	23.00	34.40
Spring Primary C	406	298	33.00	40.70
Gain		39	10.00	6.30
Form U Schools: N = 4				
Fall Primary B	42	427	14.60	27.82
Spring Primary C	42	489	15.50	28.57
Gain		62	0.90	0.75
Total Fall	448	NA	22.20	33.91
Total Spring	448	NA	30.60	39.33
Gain			8.40	5.42

[1]CTBS, Form S, Levels B and C with 4 schools using Form U
[2]All out-of-level scores have been converted to in-level scores
[3]Expanded scale scores for Form U and Form S are not equivalent

The objective for grade 2 states that students will achieve a gain of four (4.00) NCEs from fall to spring. Table 3 shows that this objective was attained by the students who took Form S of the CTBS but not by those in the much smaller group taking Form U. For the grade 2 group as a whole, the objective was achieved with an average NCE gain of 5.42. This gain for grade 2 students is noticeably smaller than the gain for 1983-84 and smaller than state and national averages which were around 10.00 NCE that year.

Table 4 displays the expected and achieved test scores for nonpublic schools, grade one Chapter I programs. Included are expanded scale scores, percentiles, and normal curve equivalents. All nonpublic school grade one students were administered Primary Level B of the CTBS, Form S.

TABLE 4
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS*
SPRING 1985, CHAPTER I NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS, GRADE 1
POSTTEST SCORES
N = 39

Expected Expanded Scale Score	214.0
Achieved Expanded Scale Score	267.0
Expected Percentile	28.2
Achieved Percentile	53.0
Expected Normal Curve Equivalent	15.0
Achieved Normal Curve Equivalent	51.6

*CTBS, Form S, Level B, 1974

The achieved scores are considerably higher than the expected scores. The scores, which are higher than those of the public schools, could reflect a difference in the population of students served at this grade level in public and nonpublic schools as well as program differences.

Table 5 shows the scores of the 32 second grade, Chapter I nonpublic school students who were administered CTBS Form S Primary B as pretests in Fall 1983 and Primary C as the posttest in the Spring. Results are reported in mean expanded scale scores, percentiles, and normal curve equivalents. The objective stated earlier indicated that a gain of 4.00 NCEs was expected between the Fall and Spring administrations of the tests. The average gain was 6.20 NCEs, indicating that the objective was met. This gain is slightly larger than that for the PPS Chapter I students, but noticeably smaller than the average gain of about 10.00 NCEs for the State and nation last year.

TABLE 5
COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS*
CHAPTER I NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS, GRADE 2
PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS**

	N	Expanded Scale Score	Percentile	Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE)
Pretest Primary B	32	266	27.50	37.40
Posttest Primary C	32	307	38.00	43.60
Gain		41	10.50	6.20

*CTBS, Form S, Levels B and C
**All out-of-level scores have been converted to in-level scores

3b. Public School Chapter I Students -- Grades 3 to 8 and 9 to 12

In the Portland Public Schools, the Portland Achievement Levels Tests (PALT) in reading, math, and language usage are administered District-wide in the fall and spring to all students in grades 3 through 8. At the high school level only Chapter I students are tested in fall and spring using the PALT.

National norms are not established for the PALT. However, tables to convert RIT scores obtained from the tests to NCE for grades 3 through 8 were products of a study sponsored jointly by the Oregon Department of Education and the U.S. Office of Education[1]. The development of similar conversion tables for internal use with grades 9 through 12 was completed in Spring 1981 by the Evaluation Department of the Portland Public Schools. Results in terms of RIT and NCE scores have been reported for reading and math for all Chapter I students in grades 3 through 12 since 1981.

Tables of mean reading and math scores are shown first using RIT scores. Tables showing the RIT scores converted to NCE scores follow. In compiling the data, only scores matching fall and spring were included; therefore, the Ns are smaller than those reported as served by the project. Scores for non-Chapter I and for all grade 3 through 8 students (i.e., Chapter I plus non-Chapter I) in the District are also shown for comparison purposes.

The Fall and Spring mean RIT scores of Chapter I, non-Chapter I and Total District for reading and math are shown in Table 6. As expected, due to selection, the scores of Chapter I students are the lowest of the three groups. A common criterion used by schools besides teacher judgment for selecting Chapter I students is previous Spring RIT scores equal to P-scores of 43 or less. This score is about the 24th percentile, or an NCE of about 35. Fall scores of Chapter I students are at or below this level, indicating that those selected were lower performing students. Scores of grade 3 students are slightly above the criterion, perhaps reflecting the fact that other measures are used in selecting grade 3 students the previous Spring because District-wide testing does not include grade 2. (The P-score scale is a standard score scale based only on Portland District students. It has a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.)

Except for two grades in math, achievement scores in Table 6 show that Chapter I students made larger gains than non-Chapter I and total District students in both reading and math. With few exceptions, over the last six years the gains of Chapter I students have been larger than the average District gains in every grade in reading. In math, Chapter I gains have more frequently been larger, but not quite as consistently as in reading. Thus, the trend of higher Chapter I gains is maintained.

Comparisons of the Chapter I student gains for 1984-85 with those of previous years showed the gains for last year were quite satisfactory. The gains were generally noticeably larger than in previous years except 1983-84. The observation that the gains for 1984-85 were a little smaller than those for 1983-84 is not surprising, because districtwide testing was conducted earlier in the Fall and later in the Spring the latter year.

---

[1]Holmes, Susan E., ESEA Title I Linking Project, Final Report, Oregon Department of Education, January, 1980.

TABLE 6
FALL 1984 AND SPRING 1985 READING AND MATH SCORES (RIT MEAN)
FOR CHAPTER I, NON-CHAPTER I, AND TOTAL DISTRICT STUDENTS
GRADES 3 THROUGH 12*

		READING				MATH			
GRADE	GROUP	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN
3	Chapter I	427	172.24	181.00	8.76	306	173.01	183.66	10.65
	Non-Chapter I	2477	193.51	198.82	5.31	2662	187.67	198.51	10.84
	Total District	2899	190.70	196.53	5.83	2968	186.16	196.98	10.82
4	Chapter I	414	181.13	188.43	7.30	403	183.69	193.13	9.44
	Non-Chapter I	2621	200.19	206.62	6.43	2654	199.75	208.09	8.34
	Total District	3035	197.59	204.14	6.55	3057	197.61	206.12	8.51
5	Chapter I	386	185.89	192.23	7.91	385	191.10	198.11	7.01
	Non-Chapter I	2446	207.38	213.35	5.97	2460	209.04	215.34	6.30
	Total District	2841	203.80	209.94	6.14	2845	206.61	213.01	6.40
6	Chapter I	327	191.94	196.87	4.93	299	196.66	204.36	7.70
	Non-Chapter I	2655	211.79	216.55	4.76	2696	214.47	221.87	7.40
	Total District	2982	209.61	214.39	4.78	2995	212.69	220.12	7.43
7	Chapter I	274	194.70	201.10	6.40	276	201.50	209.07	7.57
	Non-Chapter I	2605	216.81	221.55	4.74	2613	222.21	228.86	8.65
	Total District	2879	214.71	219.60	4.89	2889	220.23	226.97	6.74
8	Chapter I	245	199.12	205.60	6.48	280	206.40	214.03	7.63
	Non-Chapter I	2964	221.33	225.53	4.20	2920	227.40	233.75	6.35
	Total District	3209	219.63	224.01	4.38	3200	225.56	231.87	6.31
9	Chapter I	177	204.24	207.63	3.39	140	204.59	211.65	7.06
10	Chapter I	65	203.94	207.28	3.34	10	203.20	208.10	4.90
11	Chapter I	46	203.24	206.00	2.76	-	-	-	-
12	Chapter I	26	197.65	201.08	3.43	11	203.00	208.00	5.00

*No District-wide testing in Grades 9 through 12

TABLE 7
FALL 1984 AND SPRING 1985 READING AND MATH SCORES (NCE MEAN)
FOR CHAPTER I, NON-CHAPTER I, AND TOTAL DISTRICT STUDENTS
GRADES 3 THROUGH 12*

		READING				MATH		
GRADE	GROUP	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN	N	FALL	SPRING	GAIN
3	Chapter I	427	37.14	37.03	-0.11	306	39.52	39.00	-0.52
	Non-Chapter I	2477	62.32	58.43	-3.89	2662	65.32	59.97	-5.35
	Total District	2899	58.71	55.38	-3.33	2968	62.22	58.27	-3.95
4	Chapter I	414	32.22	38.26	6.04	403	28.96	37.98	9.40
	Non-Chapter I	2621	60.56	58.82	-1.74	2654	60.37	61.20	0.83
	Total District	3035	56.73	56.06	-0.67	3057	56.38	58.30	1.92
5	Chapter I	386	28.74	36.65	7.91	385	26.54	34.65	8.11
	Non-Chapter I	2446	61.13	62.82	1.69	2460	61.08	60.47	-0.61
	Total District	2841	56.37	58.31	1.94	2845	56.98	57.05	0.07
6	Chapter I	327	28.86	34.11	5.25	299	20.72	33.42	12.70
	Non-Chapter I	2655	59.53	60.37	0.84	2696	58.89	62.36	3.47
	Total District	2982	56.00	57.33	1.33	2995	55.15	59.03	3.88
7	Chapter I	274	13.95	30.76	16.81	276	11.63	31.18	19.55
	Non-Chapter I	2605	60.54	62.05	1.51	2613	59.16	62.15	2.99
	Total District	2879	57.17	59.64	2.47	2889	55.74	59.62	3.88
8	Chapter I	245	9.30	26.19	16.89	280	13.62	31.03	17.41
	Non-Chapter I	2964	59.14	60.91	1.77	2920	58.56	62.11	3.55
	Total District	3209	56.37	58.79	2.42	3200	55.67	59.81	4.14
9	Chapter I	177	22.42	28.87	6.45	140	9.00	24.56	15.56
10	Chapter I	65	1.00	6.13	5.13	10	1.00	2.15	1.15
11	Chapter I	46	1.00	1.00	0.00	---	---	---	---
12	Chapter I	26	1.00	1.00	0.00	1	1.00	1.85	0.85

*No District-wide testing in Grades 9 through 12

Reading and math RIT scores in Table 6 were converted to the appropriate NCEs by using the publisher's norms. The NCEs in Table 7 can be compared to those of previous years and to scores for national and state populations.

As expected, the Fall and Spring mean NCE scores of the Chapter I students in each grade are lower than those of the comparison groups in both reading and math. The gains of Chapter I students in all grades and in both subjects, however, are larger than those of the comparison groups and generally larger than zero. Like percentiles, a gain of zero would indicate that the students made gains comparable to the norming population; therefore, the positive gains for Chapter I, and also for District students as well, are interpreted as being larger than those made by the norming group. Statewide NCE gains of Chapter I students in grades 3 to 8 the last two years range from about 6 to 8 in reading and about 7 to 9 in math. Except for grade 3, the gains of the District Chapter I students are as large or larger than the state averages of the previous years.

It should be noted that where the Fall NCE scores are numerically lower (e.g., 25 NCEs or less), the gains are larger than when the Fall scores are higher. The larger gains of Chapter I students in grades 6 through 8 may be related to the lower Fall scores.

It is interesting to note again this year that the NCE scores for the Total District are above 50.00, which is taken as the average of the national norming population. Except for grade 3, the average gains are nearly all positive, indicating an important gain by District students.

The results for grades 9 to 12 are difficult to interpret. There are fewer Chapter I students for whom there are scores in grades 10 to 12, especially in math, and they represent a disproportionate number of the lowest performing students. Scores for high school students District-wide are not available for comparison, and also RIT scores converted to NCE scores are not useful for interpreting gains in terms of national norms because the scores were too low.

RIT and NCE results for high school students both show gains that are noticeably smaller than those for students in grades 3 to 8. Statewide NCE gains of high school students for 1983-84 were smaller than those for grades 3 to 8 also. In general, the Fall NCE scores of the grade 9 students are much like those for the other grades and much like those for the state population. Scores for students in grades 10 to 12 do not show corresponding gains.

The value of RIT scores over NCE scores in evaluating Chapter I high school performances is apparent in grades 10 to 12. Table 7 shows that the mean RIT scores of these students were too low to be converted to meaningful NCE scores. In the Portland Chapter I evaluation, low performing high school students are assigned test levels appropriate for their performances, and they may be assigned levels much lower than those appropriate for their grade levels. In using nationally standardized tests, it is generally accepted that tests which are only one level above or below the appropriate grade level may be used for out-of-level testing. The levels of PALT used in Portland high school Chapter I evaluation may exceed the accepted one level standard.

Overall, the achievements of the public school Chapter I students for 1984-85 appear satisfactory when compared to available data. The gains this past year were equal to, or larger than, gains made in previous years and equal to, or larger than, the gains of comparison groups locally, statewide, and nationally.

3.c Nonpublic School Chapter I Students -- Grades 4 to 8

Portland Achievement Levels Tests in reading and math were all administered in Spring 1984 and again in Spring 1985 to students in the District's Chapter I nonpublic schools. Results are reported for students in grades 4 through 8 with Spring 1984 scores obtained when the students were in grades 3 through 7. In interpreting the results, some comparisons are made with results for public schools, so the reader is reminded that the pretest for nonpublic school students was spring of the previous year. Some comparisons are made on a Spring-to-Spring basis where the gains of the public school students are not obtained from entirely match scores, so the reader is cautioned of this discrepancy.

Reading and math results expressed in terms of RIT scores are shown in Table 8. Spring 1984, or pretest scores, are much lower than the Spring scores of public school students in the same, corresponding grades, so the students appear to be selected appropriately for Chapter I services. District-wide results for public school students over the years generally show Spring-to-Spring gain in reading of about 8 to 9 RIT points for grades 4; 6 to 7 for grades 5 and 6; and about 5 for grades 7 and 8. The gains of the nonpublic school Chapter I students tend to be slightly larger so the reading achievements appear to be satisfactory.

In math, District-wide results of public school students for past years generally show Spring-to-Spring RIT gains of about 10 to 11 for grade 4; 8 to 9 for grade 5; 6 to 7.5 for grades 6 and 7; and about 6.0 for grade 8. Again, the gains of the nonpublic school Chapter I students tend to be larger, so the achievements appear satisfactory.

Table 9 shows the RIT scores converted to NCE scores. The pretest, or Spring 1984, scores are noticeably higher than the expected scores of public school Chapter I students. The negative gains are quite small and are interpreted as being slightly smaller than those of the norming population. On the other hand, the positive gains are large, even larger than State averages for schools testing on a Spring-to-Spring cycle. Overall, the gains of the non-public school Chapter I students appear to be satisfactory.

TABLE 8
SPRING READING AND MATH SCORES (RIT) FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL
CHAPTER I STUDENTS -- GRADES 4 THROUGH 8

	Reading				Math			
Grade	N	1984	1985	Gain	N	1984	1985	Gain
4	21	180.52	191.43	10.91	14	176.57	193.43	16.86
5	12	187.42	193.75	6.33	6	189.67	196.83	7.16
6	14	189.50	201.00	11.50	12	194.42	206.67	12.25
7	14	196.57	201.86	5.29	12	199.67	212.58	12.91
8	6	200.33	206.17	5.84	5	203.60	212.80	9.20

TABLE 9
SPRING READING AND MATH SCORES (NCE) FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL
CHAPTER I STUDENTS -- GRADES 4 THROUGH 8

	Reading				Math			
Grade	N	1984	1985	Gain	N	1984	1985	Gain
4	21	36.54	41.98	5.44	14	29.63	38.21	8.58
5	12	37.47	37.16	-0.31	6	32.92	32.54	-0.38
6	14	31.87	39.35	7.48	12	28.37	37.01	8.64
7	14	33.63	32.30	-1.33	12	25.18	38.11	12.93
8	6	29.09	27.56	-1.53	5	16.58	28.30	11.72

4. FINDINGS OF SPECIAL CHAPTER I STUDIES

The special Chapter I studies in the Portland project have involved what may be considered as two approaches to increasing the achievement of Chapter I students. In one approach, exemplary programs are adopted and implemented by schools that wish to use them. The second is a long-term theory based research approach in which arrangements and practices readily accepted and adopted by school personnel are studied and determined to be effective.

Three exemplary programs have been implemented at some time during the last four years. Various programs of computer use in instruction were implemented and their use, mostly in school adapted form, continues in many Chapter I schools. HOSTS and Prescription Learning, two programs familiar to most PPS personnel, have continued to be used. The latter two are more easily recognized, self-contained systems in which students are placed usually for the full school year; and, for this reason special studies of these programs have been conducted each year. Computer use varies considerbly from school to school, and currently no vendor works cooperatively with the Chapter I Project coordinator to facilitate implementation. Special studies of computer use were not conducted because no uniform use of computers across schools was apparent.

Results from the studies of HOSTS and Prescription Learning are reported in detail in separate reports. Essentially, the results over the last four years quite consistently show that based upon average gains across the grades and Chapter I schools in which the programs are implemented, neither stands out as being appreciably better at producing gains than the more traditional Chapter I programs designed by the other Chapter I schools. Program students in nearly all Chapter I schools make gains equal to or greater than the District average; however, among individual schools and among grades there are wide variations.

Most reports involving Chapter I tend to focus on Chapter I programs as the main, if not the only, significantly different treatment variable. Advocates and foes alike of Chapter I tend to assign causal relations directly to the program. Earlier longitudinal studies of District students enrolled in Chapter I programs in some years and not in others indicated quite definitely the impact of the total school program. More recent investigations and analyses of data tend to support the contention that total school experiences of Chapter I students must be considered in relation to achievement scores by which the success of a program is measured.

In the 1984-85 school year, a research model was developed and the initial phase of identifying and operationalizing significant treatment variables, e.g., instructional arrangements and classroom practices, was undertaken. The step was necessary because general conditions often referred to as effective practices in effective schools literature were observed, but these distinctions were not sufficiently explicit to be useful. A classification of

[1]HOSTS is for reading only; Prescription Learning has a program for both reading and math.

observed conditions into four main categories was completed. The next step is to develop tentative theories, operationalize the treatment variables involved in the theories and develop ways to measure the variables. Subsequent research will be the design of studies to test hypotheses generated from the theories. Details of the 1984-85 study are presented in a separate report currently in draft form.

5. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS

During the 1984-85 school year, Portland Chapter I schools implemented three kinds of programs for about 6500 Chapter I students: HOSTS, Prescription Learning, and Garden Variety individual school-developed programs. Summative evaluation of the Portland project showed satisfactory progress of the students overall in reading and math during the school year regardless of the particular program in which they were enrolled. Differences in achievement of students in the three instructional programs were not sufficiently different to merit an endorsement of one program over another. The average gains of nearly every Chapter I school program were equal to or larger than the average for the District.

Ongoing research within the District Chapter I project is now focused on the total school experiences of Chapter I students. It is postulated that there are a limited number of critical elements or variables in educational programs which account for most student achievement. The extent of the effect is related to the extent the element or variable is present or absent in the students' learning environment. A research model and strategy for studying selected variables and their effect on student achievement have been developed.

6. INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL DATA FOR GRADE 1 AND STATE CHAPTER 1 REPORTING FORMS

(This section of the report is optional, and may be deleted for some distribution. It consists of tables of individual school results for Grade 1 Chapter I students and State Chapter I reporting forms. State forms include one each for reporting achievements in reading and math for individual schools. The results presented earlier in Section 3 are compilations made from individual school data.)